arXiv:1608.05886v1 [math.DS] 21 Aug 2016

SMOOTHNESS OF STABLE HOLONOMIES INSIDE CENTER-STABLE MANIFOLDS AND THE C^2 HYPOTHESIS IN PUGH–SHUB AND LEDRAPPIER–YOUNG THEORY

AARON BROWN

ABSTRACT. Under a suitable bunching condition, we establish that stable holonomies inside center-stable manifolds for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms are uniformly bi-Lipschitz and in fact $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$. This verifies that the Pugh–Shub theory for ergodicity holds for suitably center-bunched, $C^{1+\beta}$, essentially accessible, partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism and verifies that the Ledrappier–Young entropy formulas hold for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms of compact manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, in [BW1], Burns and Wilkinson establish the ergodicity (and K-property) of partially hyperbolic, center-bunched, essentially accessible C^2-diffeomorphisms. This extends a number of earlier results including [GPS] and [PS2]. A similar result (with stronger center-bunching conditions) was announced for $C^{1+\delta}$-diffeomorphisms. However, it seems that the bunching condition given in [BW1, Theorem 0.3] is possibly too weak for the method of proof. A proof of the technical result needed to establish [BW1, Theorem 0.3] was circulated as an unpublished note in [BW2]. It seems some of the details of the proof in [BW2] are incorrect. We correct the details of the proof of the main result in [BW2] and obtain a proof of [BW1, Theorem 0.3] under somewhat stronger bunching hypotheses.

Secondly, in two seminal papers [LY1, LY2] Ledrappier and Young prove remarkable results relating the metric entropy of a C^2 diffeomorphism $f\colon M \to M$ of a compact manifold M, its Lyapunov exponents, and the geometry of conditional measures along unstable manifolds. In [LY1], the SRB property of measures satisfying the Pesin entropy formula is established for C^2 diffeomorphisms and measures with zero Lyapunov exponents. This extends Ledrappier's result from [Led] which established the SRB property for hyperbolic measures invariant under $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms satisfying the Pesin entropy formula. In [LY2], a more general formula for the entropy of arbitrary measures invariant under a C^2 diffeomorphism is derived.

As remarked in [LY1], there is one crucial step in which the C^2 hypothesis rather than the $C^{1+\beta}$ hypothesis on the dynamics is used: establishing the Lipschitzness of unstable holonomies inside center-unstable sets. In [LY2], the corresponding estimate is the Lipschitzness of the holonomies along intermediate unstable foliations inside the total unstable manifolds. In the case of hyperbolic measures, the entropy formula from [LY2] is known to hold for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms as it is sufficient to establish the Lipschitzness of W^i holonomies inside the W^{i+1} manifolds (corresponding to Lyapunov exponents $\lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1} > 0$) on Pesin sets. This Lipschitzness of holonomies along intermediate

Date: August 23, 2016.

unstable manifolds was established in [BPS, Appendix]. However, the proof in [BPS, Appendix] fails to establish Lipschitzness of unstable holonomies inside center-unstable sets which is needed to show the main result of [LY1]: that the entropy of f is "carried entirely by the unstable manifolds." The results of this note establish the Lipschitzness of unstable holonomies inside center-unstable sets which confirms that the results of [LY1, LY2] hold for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms and invariant measures with zero Lyapunov exponents.

In Section 3 we establish under certain bunching conditions that the stable holonomies for certain globalized $C^{1+\beta}$ dynamics are Lipschitz and, in fact, $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$. The main result, Theorem 2.2, is formulated in a sufficiently abstract setting so that it may be applied to a number of settings. In Sections 4 and 5 we briefly justify how the results discussed above follow from Theorem 2.2.

2. Statement of main theorem

2.1. **Setup.** For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$L_n = \begin{pmatrix} A_n & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_n \end{pmatrix}$$

be an invertible linear map where each A_n, B_n, and C_n is a square matrix with dimension constant in n. We assume the matrices are non-trivial though the results can be formulated (with fewer conditions) in the case that C_n vanishes. We assume there are constants

$$-\mu < \eta_n' < \kappa_n' < \gamma_n' \leq \hat{\gamma}_n' < \hat{\kappa}_n' < \hat{\eta}_n' < \mu$$

such that for every n

(1) $e^{\eta_n'} \leq m(A_n) \leq \|A_n\| \leq e^{\kappa_n'}$;
(2) $e^{\gamma_n'} \leq m(B_n) \leq \|B_n\| \leq e^{\hat{\gamma}_n'}$;
(3) $e^{\hat{\kappa}_n'} \leq m(C_n) \leq \|C_n\| \leq e^{\hat{\eta}_n'}$.

Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm induced by the standard norm on the corresponding Euclidean spaces and $m(A)$ denotes the conorm of A. Throughout, we will always assume that $\sup\{\kappa_n'\} < 0$. We do not impose any assumptions on the signs of γ_n', $\hat{\gamma}_n'$, $\hat{\kappa}_n'$ and $\hat{\eta}_n'$. We moreover assume that

$$\inf\{|\kappa_n' - \gamma_n'|, \hat{\kappa}_n' - \hat{\gamma}_n', |\kappa_n'|\} > 0.$$

Take any

$$0 < \epsilon' \leq \inf\{|\kappa_n' - \gamma_n'|, \hat{\kappa}_n' - \hat{\gamma}_n', |\kappa_n'|, 1\}/100$$

and let $\kappa_n = \kappa_n' + 2\epsilon'$, $\hat{\kappa}_n = \hat{\kappa}_n' - 2\epsilon'$, $\eta_n = \eta_n' - 2\epsilon'$, $\hat{\eta}_n = \hat{\eta}_n' + 2\epsilon'$, $\gamma_n = \gamma_n' - 2\epsilon'$, $\hat{\gamma}_n = \hat{\gamma}_n' + 2\epsilon'$, and $\epsilon = 4\epsilon'$. Given a fixed $0 < \beta \leq 1$ we moreover assume that $\hat{\gamma}_n' - \gamma_n'$ and ϵ' are sufficiently small so that there exist $0 < \overline{\theta} < \beta$ satisfying

$$\sup \frac{e^{\kappa_n}}{e^{\eta_n \overline{\theta} + \gamma_n}} < 1 \text{ and } \sup \frac{e^{-\hat{\kappa}_n}}{e^{-\hat{\eta}_n \overline{\theta} - \hat{\gamma}_n}} < 1 \tag{1}$$

and $\theta \leq \overline{\theta}$ with

$$\sup \frac{e^{\beta \kappa_n}}{e^{\kappa_n \theta + \beta \gamma_n}} < 1 \tag{2}$$

and

$$\sup \frac{\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n}{-\kappa_n} < \theta. \tag{3}$$

Condition (3) is a bunching condition. Condition (1) ensures the tangent distributions defined below are $\overline{\theta}$-Hölder. Note that with $\theta = \overline{\theta}$, (3) is the bunching condition stated

in [BW1, Theorem 0.3]. Our proof however requires the extra bunching imposed by (2). Note from (1) that $\theta = \beta\overline{\theta}$ satisfies (2).

We fix such $0 < \theta \leq \overline{\theta} < \beta$ for the remainder. Also fix $\alpha > 0$ and $\hat{\theta} < \theta \leq \overline{\theta} < \hat{\beta} < \beta$ for the remainder with

$$\sup\left\{\frac{(1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)}{-\kappa_n}\right\} < \hat{\theta}, \text{ and } \sup\left\{\frac{\kappa_n}{\kappa_n - \gamma_n}\theta\right\} < \hat{\beta}. \tag{4}$$

Set $\overline{\kappa} = \sup\{\kappa_n\} < 0$ and

$$\omega = \sup\{\kappa_n\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)\} < 0, \quad \hat{\omega} = \sup\{\kappa_n\hat{\theta} + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)\} < 0.$$

We decompose $\mathbb{R}^k$ into subvector spaces $\mathbb{R}^k = \mathbb{R}^s \oplus \mathbb{R}^c \oplus \mathbb{R}^u$ according to the block decomposition preserved by each L_n. We let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the standard Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^k$ and write d for the induced distance. Given a subspace $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ we write SU for the unit sphere in U relative to the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$. If $T\colon U \to V$ is linear we write $T_*\colon SU \to SV$ for the induced map. We recall that if $T\colon U \to V$ is a linear isomorphism with $a \leq m(T) \leq \|T\| \leq b$ then T_* is bi-Lipschitz with constants $b^{-1}a$ and ba^{-1}. Finally, if $N \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is an embedded submanifold we write $SN := STN$ for the sphere bundle over N. Given $g\colon N_1 \to N_2$ a diffeomorphism we write $g_*\colon SN_1 \to SN_2$ to be the renormalized derivative map

$$g_*(x,v) = \left(g(x), \frac{1}{\|D_x g v\|} D_x g(v)\right).$$

In what follows, we consider $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism $f\colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ with uniform estimates: namely, viewing Df as a map from $\mathbb{R}^k$ to the space of linear maps we assume $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^k}\|D_x f\| < \infty$ and that Df is Hölder continuous with

$$\text{Höl}^\beta(Df) := \sup_{x\neq y}\left\{\frac{\|D_x f - D_y f\|}{d(x,y)^\beta}\right\} < \infty.$$

Given submanifolds N_1 and N_2 and a diffeomorphism $h\colon N_1 \to N_2$ then, as the linear maps $D_x h$ and $D_y h$ have different domains for $x \neq y \in N_1$, we define the Hölder variation of Dh and h_* as functions between metric spaces. Assuming N_1 has bounded diameter, define the β-Hölder variation of $Dh\colon TN_1 \to TN_2$ to be

$$\text{Höl}^\beta(Dh) := \sup_{(x,v)\neq(y,u)\in SN_1}\left\{\frac{d\left(Dh(x,v), Dh(y,u)\right)}{d\left((x,v),(y,u)\right)^\beta}\right\}$$

where, given (x,v) and (y,u) in $T\mathbb{R}^k$, we write

$$d\left((x,v),(y,u)\right) = \max\{d(x,y), d(v,u)\}.$$

Similarly define $\text{Höl}^\beta(h_*)$. The $C^{1+\beta}$-norm of h is $\max\{\|h\|_{C^1}, \text{Höl}^\beta(Dh)\}$.

For the remainder, we let $f_n\colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ be a sequence of uniformly $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms with $f_n(0) = 0$ for each n. Given $\epsilon' > 0$ as above, we assume there is a $C_0 > 1$ so that for each n

(1) $\|f_n - L_n\|_{C^1} \leq \epsilon'$, and $\|f_n^{-1} - L_n^{-1}\|_{C^1} \leq \epsilon'$;
(2) $\text{Höl}^\beta(Df) < C_0$, and $\text{Höl}^\beta(Df^{-1}) < C_0$,

Note then that for some $C_1 \geq C_0 > 1$ we have

(3) $\text{Höl}^\beta_{\text{loc}}((f_n)_*) \leq C_1$, and $\text{Höl}^\beta_{\text{loc}}((f_n^{-1})_*) \leq C_1$;
(4) $\|(D_x f_n^{\pm 1})_*\|_{C^1} \leq C_1$ and $\|D_x f_n^{\pm 1}\| \leq C_1$ for every x.

Here, $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta}_{\mathrm{loc}}(f_*)$ is the local Hölder variation of $f_*\colon S\mathbb{R}^k \to S\mathbb{R}^k$ given by

$$\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta}_{\mathrm{loc}}(f_*) := \sup_{0<d((x,v),(y,u))\leq 1} \left\{ \frac{d\left(f_*(x,v), f_*(y,u)\right)}{d\left((x,v),(y,u)\right)^{\beta}} \right\}.$$

As it follows from all applications, we may moreover assume that $f_n(y) = L_n(y)$ for all y with $\|y\| \geq 1$.

From the graph transform method, we may construct for the sequence f_n pseudo-stable manifolds through every point of $\mathbb{R}^n$. (See [HPS] and discussion in [BW1, Section 3] for more details.) In particular, we have the following.

Proposition 2.1. *There exists a $\beta' > \overline{\theta}$ and $\beta'' > 0$ so that for every sufficiently small $\epsilon' > 0$ and every $C_1 > 1$ as above there is a $\hat{C} > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\star = \{u, c, s, cu, cs\}$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there are manifolds $W^{\star}_n(x)$ containing x with*

(1) $e^{\hat{\kappa}_n} d(x,y) \leq d(f_n(x), f_n(y)) \leq e^{\hat{\eta}_n} d(x,y)$ for $y \in W^u_n(x)$;
(2) $e^{\gamma_n} d(x,y) \leq d(f_n(x), f_n(y)) \leq e^{\hat{\eta}_n} d(x,y)$ for $y \in W^{cu}_n(x)$;
(3) $e^{\gamma_n} d(x,y) \leq d(f_n(x), f_n(y)) \leq e^{\hat{\gamma}_n} d(x,y)$ for $y \in W^{c}_n(x)$;
(4) $e^{\eta_n} d(x,y) \leq d(f_n(x), f_n(y)) \leq e^{\hat{\gamma}_n} d(x,y)$ for $y \in W^{cs}_n(x)$;
(5) $e^{\eta_n} d(x,y) \leq d(f_n(x), f_n(y)) \leq e^{\kappa_n} d(x,y)$ for $y \in W^{s}_n(x)$;
(6) $f_n(W^{\star}_n(x)) = W^{\star}_{n+1}(f_n(x))$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(7) If $y \in W^{\star}_n(x)$ then $W^{\star}_n(x) = W^{\star}_n(y)$. In particular, the partition into $W^{\star}_n$-manifolds foliates $\mathbb{R}^k$; moreover, the partition into W^s_n-manifolds subfoliates each $W^{cs}_n(x)$.
(8) Each $W^{\star}_n(x)$ is the graph of a $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$ function $G^{\star}_n(x)\colon \mathbb{R}^{\star} \to (\mathbb{R}^{\star})^{\perp}$ with $\|D_u G^{\star}_n(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\star}$ and
  (a) $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta}(DG^{\star}_n(x)) \leq \hat{C}$ for $\star = s$;
  (b) $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta'}(DG^{\star}_n(x)) \leq \hat{C}$ for $\star = cs, c, cu$;
  (c) $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta''}(DG^{\star}_n(x)) \leq \hat{C}$ for $\star = u$.
  Moreover, the functions $G^{\star}_n(x)$ depend continuously on x.

For a discussion of $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$-regularity, see [PS1, Section 6]. Note in particular, that each $W^{\star}_n(x)$ is uniformly $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$-embedded. We write

$$W^{\star}_n(x, R) := \{y \in W^{\star}_n(x) : d(x,y) < R\}.$$

Write $E^{\star}_n(x) := T_x W^{\star}_n(x)$. From our choice of $\overline{\theta} > 0$ satisfying (1), it follows (for example from the C^r-section theorem [HPS, page 30]; see also discussion in [BW1]) that the tangent spaces $E^{\star}_n(x)$ are Hölder continuous with exponent $\overline{\theta}$ and constant uniform in $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

2.2. **$C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$ holonomies inside center-stable manifolds.** Fix $R > 0$. Let $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and given $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ consider $q \in W^s_n(x, R)$. Let $\hat{D}_1$ and $\hat{D}_2$ be two uniformly $C^{1+\beta'}$ embedded, $\dim(\mathbb{R}^{cu})$-dimensional manifolds without boundary and with $p \in \hat{D}_1$ and $q \in \hat{D}_2$. We assume the diameter of each D_i is less than 1 and that each subspace $T_x \hat{D}_i$ is sufficiently transverse to $\mathbb{R}^s$: given $v = T_x \hat{D}_i$ with $v = v^s + v^{cu}$ we have $\|v^{cu}\| \geq 3\|v^s\|$. Let $D_1 = W^{cs}_n(p) \cap \hat{D}_1$ and $D_2 = W^{cs}_n(q) \cap \hat{D}_2$. Given $x \in D_1$ let $h_{D_1,D_2}(x)$ denote the unique point y in D_2 with $y \in W^s_n(x)$ if such a point exists. Note that the domain and codomain of h_{D_1,D_2} are open subsets of D_1 and D_2. By restriction of domain and codomain we may assume $h_{D_1,D_2}\colon D_1 \to D_2$ is a homeomorphism.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2.2. *The map h_{D_1,D_2} is a $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$ diffeomorphism for some $\hat{\alpha} > 0$. Moreover, the $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$-norm of h_{D_1,D_2} is uniform in all choices of D_1 and D_2 as above.*

In particular, we have

Corollary 2.3. *The map h_{D_1,D_2} is bi-Lipschitz with Lipschitz constants uniform in all choices of D_1 and D_2 as above.*

Recall that each $W^c_n(x)$ is a uniformly $C^{1+\beta'}$-embedded manifold and intersects $W^s_n(y)$ for every $y \in W^{cs}_n(x)$. Moreover each $E^{cu}_n(y)$ is uniformly-transverse to both $\mathbb{R}^s$ and $E^s_n(y)$. As explained below, it suffices to prove Theorem 2.2 for the distinguished family of transversals to W^s_n given by the family center manifolds. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $q \in W^s_n(p)$ we write $h^s_{p,q,n} \colon W^c_n(p) \to W^c_n(q)$ for the stable holonomy map between center manifolds. More precisely,

$$h^s_{p,q,n}(z) = W^{cu}_n(q) \cap W^s_n(z).$$

As both $\{W^s_n(x) : x \in W^{cs}_n(p)\}$ and $\{W^c_n(x) : x \in W^{cs}_n(p)\}$ subfoliate $W^{cs}_n(p)$, it follows that $h^s_{p,q,n}(z) \in W^c_n(q)$. Moreover, by the global transverseness of the manifolds the maps $h^s_{p,q,n}$ have domain all of $W^c_n(p)$.

Note that $1 < e^{\alpha\epsilon} < e^{\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)}$. For remainder, fix $0 < \delta < 1$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$1 + e^{-(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)} C_1 \delta^{\beta - \hat{\beta}} \leq e^{\alpha(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)}. \tag{5}$$

Given p, q, n with $q \in W^s_n(p)$ define

$$\rho(p, q, n) := \sup\{d(x, h^s_{p,q,n}(x)) \mid x \in W^c_n(p, 1)\}.$$

Take $0 < \rho_0 < 1$ so that

$$(3C_2C_1 + 1)^{\overline{\theta}^{-1}} \rho_0 \leq \delta \tag{6}$$

where $C_2 \geq 1$ is a constant to be defined in Section 3.1 below. Fix $0 < R_0 < 1$ for the remainder so that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $q \in W^s_n(p, R_0)$ we have

$$\rho(p, q, n) \leq \rho_0.$$

With the above choices, we prove a special case of Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $q \in W^s_n(p, R_0)$. Then the holonomy map $h^s_{p,q,n} \colon W^c_n(p, 1) \to W^c_n(q)$ is a $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$-diffeomorphism. Moreover the $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$-norm of $h^u_{p,q,n}$ is uniform across the choice of p, q and n.*

Taking $\hat{\alpha} < \beta'$, appealing to a theorem of Journé [Jou] (see also related discussions in [PSW, Section 6]) it follows that the leaves of the partition $\{W^s_n(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^k\}$ restrict to a $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$-foliation inside each $W^{cs}_n(p)$. Theorem 2.2 then follows. In particular, given arbitrary transversals D_1 and D_2 to $\{W^s_n(x), x \in W^{cs}_n(p)\}$ inside $W^{cs}_n(p)$ as above, it follows that the holonomy map $h^s_{D_1,D_2}$ is uniformly $C^{1+\hat{\alpha}}$ on its domain.

3. Proof of Theorem 2.4

3.1. **Approximate holonomies and related notation.** Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and arbitrary $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $q \in W^s_n(p, 1)$ we assume there exists a uniformly $C^{1+\beta'}$ initial approximation

$$\pi_{p,q,n} \colon W^c_n(p, 1) \to W^c_n(q)$$

to the stable holonomy map $h^s_{p,q,n}$ with the following properties: there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ so that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $q \in W^s(p, 1)$ we have

(1) $d(\pi_{p,q,n}(p), q) \leq C_2 d(p, q)$;

(2) $d\left((\pi_{p,q,n})_*(v), v\right) \leq C_2 d(p,q)^{\overline{\theta}}$ for all $v \in S_p W_n^c(p)$;
(3) $|\|D\pi_{p,q,n}\| - 1| \leq C_2 d(p,q)^{\overline{\theta}}$;
(4) if $p' \in W_n^c(p)$ and $q' \in W_n^s(p',1) \cap W_n^c(q)$ then $\pi_{p,q,n}$ and $\pi_{p',q',n}$ coincide on $W_n^c(p,1) \cap W_n^c(p',1)$.

For instance, we may define such a system of approximating maps $\{\pi_{p,q,n}\}$ by linear projection: for $z \in W_n^c(p,1)$ define $\pi_{p,q,n}(z)$ to be the unique point of intersection of $W_n^c(q)$ and $z + \mathbb{R}^u \oplus \mathbb{R}^s$. One may verify the above properties hold for this choice of $\pi_{p,q,n}$.

3.1.1. *Additional notation.* It is enough to prove Theorem 2.4 in the case that $n = 0$. For the remainder, we fix p and q in $\mathbb{R}^k$ with $q \in W_0^s(p, R_0)$ as in Theorem 2.4. Write $h := h^s_{p,q,0}$.

Given $n, j \in \mathbb{Z}$

- $f_n^{(j)} := \mathrm{id}$, $j = 0$;
- $f_n^{(j)} := f_{n+j-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_n$, $j > 0$;
- $f_n^{(j)} := f_{n+j}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_{n-1}^{-1}$, $j < 0$;
- for $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$, write $z_n = f_0^{(n)}(z)$;
- write $D_n \subset W_n^c(p_n) := f_0^{(n)}(W_0^c(p,1))$;
- let $\kappa_\ell^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \kappa_{\ell+n-1} + \cdots + \kappa_\ell & n > 0 \\ 0 & n = 0 \\ -\kappa_{\ell+n} - \cdots - \kappa_{\ell-1} & n < 0; \end{cases}$
- similarly define $\hat{\kappa}_\ell^{(n)}$, $\gamma_\ell^{(n)}$, and $\hat{\gamma}_\ell^{(n)}$.

Note that if $x \in W_0^c(p,1) = D_0$ and $y = h(x) \in W_0^c(q)$ then for all $n \geq 0$ we have

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x,y) \leq e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho(p,q,0) < \rho_0.$$

It follows that $\pi_{x_n,y_n,n}$ is defined. By property (4) of the approximate holonomy maps $\pi_{p_n,q_n,n}$ it follows that the collection of maps $\{\pi_{x_n,y_n,n} : x_n \in D_n\}$ coincide with the restriction of a single approximation which we denote by $\pi_n \colon D_n \to W_n^c(q_n)$ for the remainder. Note that $\pi_n \colon D_n \to W_n^c(q_n)$ has all the properties enumerated above.

3.1.2. *Approximate holonomies.* For $n \geq 0$ we define $h_n \colon W_0^c(p,1) \to W_0^c(q)$ to be successive approximations to h given by

$$h_n \colon x \mapsto f_n^{(-n)}\left(\pi_n(x_n)\right)) = f_n^{(-n)}\left(\pi_n(f_0^{(n)}(x))\right).$$

Note that each h_n is a $C^{1+\beta'}$ diffeomorphisms onto its image. Although the $(1+\beta')$-norms of the h_n may not be controlled, Theorem 2.2 follows by showing that h_n converge to $h \colon W_0^c(p,1) \to W_0^c(q)$ in the C^1 topology. We then show $Dh \colon SW_0^c(p,1) \to TW_0^c(q)$ is Hölder continuous with uniform estimates.

3.2. **An auxiliary lemma.** Given $\xi = (x,v)$ and $\zeta = (y,u)$ in $S\mathbb{R}^k$ recall we write $d(\xi,\zeta) = \sup\{d(x,y), d(v,u)\}$. Given $\xi = (x,v) \in S\mathbb{R}^k$ we write

$$\xi_n = (x_n, v_n) := (f_0^{(n)})_*(\xi) \in S\mathbb{R}^k.$$

If $\zeta = (y,w)$ similarly write $\zeta_n := (y_n, w_n)$.

Recall the $\delta > 0$, α, and $\hat{\beta}$ fixed above.

Lemma 3.1. *Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\xi = (x, v)$, $\zeta = (y, w) \in SW_0^c(x)$, $0 \le r \le \delta$, and $n \ge 0$, suppose that $d(x_n, y_n) \le re^{\kappa_0^{(n)}}$, $d(\xi_n, \zeta_n) \le r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta}$, and for all $0 \le k \le n$ that*

$$d(x_k, y_k) \le \delta.$$

Then, for all $0 \le k \le n$,

$$d(x_k, y_k) \le re^{\kappa_0^{(n)} - \gamma_k^{(n-k)}} \text{ and } d(\xi_k, \zeta_k) \le r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_k^{(n-k)} - \gamma_k^{(n-k)})}.$$

In particular,

$$d(\xi, \zeta) \le r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)\left(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)}\right)}.$$

Proof. For the final assertion, note that

$$re^{\kappa_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)}} \le r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})}$$

follows from (1) as $\theta \le \frac{\kappa_n - \gamma_n}{\eta_n} \le \frac{\kappa_n - \gamma_n}{\kappa_n}$ holds for all n.

We prove the first two assertions by backwards induction on k starting with $k = n$. We clearly have

$$d(x_{(k-1)}, y_{(k-1)}) \le e^{-\gamma_{k-1}} d(x_k, y_k) \le re^{\kappa_0^{(n)} - \gamma_{k-1}^{(n-(k-1))}}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\xi_{(k-1)}, \zeta_{(k-1)}) &= d\left((f_k^{(-1)})_*(x_k, v_k), (f_k^{(-1)})_*(y_k, w_k)\right) \\
&\le d\left((f_k^{(-1)})_*(x_k, v_k), (f_k^{(-1)})_*(x_k, w_k)\right) \\
&\qquad + d\left((f_k^{(-1)})_*(x_k, w_k), (f_k^{(-1)})_*(y_k, w_k)\right) \\
&\le e^{(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} d(v_k, w_k) + C_1 d(x_k, y_k)^\beta \\
&\le e^{(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} \left(d(v_k, w_k) + e^{-(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} C_1 d(x_k, y_k)^\beta\right) \\
&\le e^{(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} \left(1 + e^{-(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} C_1 d(x_k, y_k)^{\beta - \hat{\beta}}\right) \\
&\qquad \cdot \max\{d(x_k, y_k)^{\hat{\beta}}, d(v_k, w_k)\} \\
&\le e^{(1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_{k-1} - \gamma_{k-1})} \max\{r^{\hat{\beta}} e^{\hat{\beta}\kappa_0^{(n)} - \hat{\beta}\gamma_k^{(n-k)}}, r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_k^{(n-k)} - \gamma_k^{(n-k)})}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from induction hypothesis and the choice of $\delta > 0$ in (5).

From (2) and (4) we have we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}\kappa_0^{(n)} - \hat{\beta}\gamma_k^{(n-k)} &= \hat{\beta}\kappa_0^{(k)} + \hat{\beta}\kappa_k^{(n-k)} - \hat{\beta}\gamma_k^{(n-k)} \\
&\le \hat{\beta}\kappa_0^{(k)} + \theta\kappa_k^{(n-k)} \\
&\le \theta\kappa_0^{(n)} \\
&\le \theta\kappa_0^{(n)} + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_k^{(n-k)} - \gamma_k^{(n-k)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$r^{\hat{\beta}} e^{\hat{\beta}\kappa_0^{(n)} - \hat{\beta}\gamma_k^{(n-k)}} \le r^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_k^{(n-k)} - \gamma_k^{(n-k)})}$$

and the result follows. □

3.3. **Step 1: C^0 convergence.** We have

Lemma 3.2. *$h_n \to h$ uniformly on $W_0^c(p, 1)$.*

Proof. First (by invariance of W^s_n-manifolds) we have $f_n^{(-n)} \circ h^s_{p_n,q_n,n} \circ f_0^{(n)} = h^s_{p,q,0}$. For $x \in W^c_0(p,1)$

$$d\left(x_n, f_0^{(n)}(h(x))\right) = d(x_n, h^s_{p_n,q_n,n}(x_n)) \leq e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho(p,q,0) \leq e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}}.$$

By property 1 of the maps π_n,

$$\begin{aligned} d(h_n(x), h(x)) &= d\left(f_0^{(-n)}(\pi_n(x_n)), f_n^{(-n)}(h^s_{p_n,q_n,n}(x_n))\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\gamma_0^{(n)}} d\left(\pi_n(x_n), h^s_{p_n,q_n,n}(x_n)\right) \\ &\leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.4. **Step 2: Convergence of the projectivized derivative.** Consider now the projectivized derivatives $(h_n)_* \colon SW^c_0(p,1) \to SW^c_0(q)$. We show that the sequence $(h_n)_*$ is Cauchy. Set

$$L_1 = C_2 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 3C_2 C_1 e^{\omega n}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *The family of maps $(h_n)_* \colon SW^c_0(p) \to SW^c_0(q)$ is uniformly Cauchy on $SW^c_0(p,1)$.*

Moreover, defining $h_* \colon SW^c_0(p,1) \to SW^c_0(q)$ to be the limit $h_* = \lim_{n\to\infty}(h_n)_*$, for $(x,v) \in SW^c_0(p,1)$ we have

$$d((x,v), h_*(x,v)) \leq L_1 d(x, h(x))^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

Proof. With $\xi = (x,v)$ let $y = h(x)$ and $\zeta^n = (y^n, w^n) = (h_n)_*(\xi)$.

We have

$$d(y^n, y^{n+1}) = d\left(f_n^{(-n)}(\pi_n(x_n)), f_{(n+1)}^{(-n-1)}(\pi_{n+1}(x_{n+1}))\right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\pi_n(x_n), f_{n+1}^{(-1)}(\pi_{n+1}(x_{n+1}))\right) &\leq d\left(x_n, \pi_n(x_n)\right) + \left(f_{n+1}^{(-1)}(x_{n+1}), f_{n+1}^{(-1)}(\pi_{n+1}(x_{n+1}))\right) \\ &\leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x,y) + C_1 C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n+1)}} d(x,y) \\ &\leq 2C_1 C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$d(\zeta^n, \zeta^{n+1}) = d\left((f_n^{(-n)})_*(\pi_n)_*(\xi_n), (f_{n+1}^{(-n-1)})_*(\pi_{n+1})_*(\xi_{n+1})\right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &d((\pi_n)_*(\xi_n), (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(\pi_{n+1})_*(\xi_{n+1})) \\ &\qquad \leq d\left(\xi_n, (\pi_n)_*(\xi_n)\right) + d\left((f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*\xi_{n+1}, (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(\pi_{n+1})_*(\xi_{n+1})\right). \end{aligned}$$

With $(\pi_{n+1})_*(x_{n+1}, v_{n+1}) = (y', w')$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d((f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*\xi_{n+1}, (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(\pi_{n+1})_*(\xi_{n+1})) &= d((f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(x_{n+1}, v_{n+1}), (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(y', w')) \\
&\le d((f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(x_{n+1}, v_{n+1}), (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(x_{n+1}, w')) + d((f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(x_{n+1}, w'), (f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(y', w')) \\
&\le C_1 d(v_{n+1}, w') + C_1 d(x_{n+1}, y')^\beta \\
&\le C_1 C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n+1)}\overline{\theta}} d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}} + C_1 C_2^\beta e^{\beta\kappa_0^{(n+1)}} d(x, y)^\beta \\
&\le 2C_1 C_2 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n+1)}} d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}}
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
d((\pi_n)_*(\xi_n), &(f_{n+1}^{(-1)})_*(\pi_{n+1})_*(\xi_{n+1})) \\
&\le C_2 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}} + 2C_1 C_2 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n+1)}} d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}} \\
&\le 3C_2 C_1 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1 (with $r = (3C_1C_2)^{\overline{\theta}^{-1}} d(x, y)$) and the choice of ρ_0 it follows that

$$d(\zeta^n, \zeta^{n+1}) \le e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})} 3C_2 C_1 d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}}. \tag{7}$$

It follows that $(h_n)_*$ is uniformly Cauchy on $SW_0^c(p, 1)$.

Moreover, for any $\xi = (x, v) \in SW_0^c(p, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\xi, h_*(\xi)) &\le d(\xi, (\pi_0)_*\xi) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d(\zeta^n, \zeta^{n+1}) \\
&\le C_2 d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})} 3C_2 C_1 d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, with L_1 as above, for any $\xi \in SW_0^c(p, 1)$ we have

$$d(\xi, h_*(\xi)) \le L_1 d(x, y)^{\overline{\theta}}. \qquad \square$$

Note that the convergence of the projectivized derivative of the stable holonomies in Lemma 3.3 is independent of the choice of $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$ or $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in Theorem 2.2. Thus for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p' \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $q' \in W_n^s(p', R_0)$ let $(h_{p',q',n}^s)_*$ denote the projectivized derivative constructed as above. We have for all $\xi' = (x', v') \in SW_n^c(p', 1)$ that

$$d(\xi, (h_{p',q',n}^s)_*(\xi)) \le L_1 d(x', h_{p',q',n}^s(x'))^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

To show that the holonomies are C^1, we next show that each $(h_{p',q',n}^s)_*$ coincides with the projectivization of a continuous $Dh_{p',q',n}^u \colon TW_n^c(p', 1) \to TW_n^c(q')$.

3.5. **Step 3: The sequence of maps Dh_n is uniformly Cauchy.** We return to the notation in Step 2. In particular, we recall our distinguished $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and the maps h_n approximating $h = h_{p,q,0}^s$.

We first derive two simple distortion estimates. Given $\xi = (x, v) \in SW_0^c(p, 1)$ with $\xi_n := (f_0^{(n)})_*(\xi)$ let $y = h(x)$, $\zeta = (y, w) := h_*(\xi)$, $\zeta_n = (y_n, w_n) = (f_0^{(n)})_*(\zeta) = (h_{p_n,q_n,n}^s)_*(\xi_n)$, and $\hat{\zeta}^n = (h_n)_*(\xi)$. Write $\hat{\zeta}_i^n = (f_0^{(i)})_*\hat{\zeta}^n$. Then

$$\hat{\zeta}_n^n := (f_0^{(n)})_*(\hat{\zeta}^n) = (\hat{y}_n^n, \hat{w}_n) = (\pi_n)_*(\xi_n).$$

We have

$$d(y_n, \hat{y}_n^n) \le (1 + C_2) e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x, y). \tag{8}$$

From Lemma 3.3 we have

$$d(\xi_n, \zeta_n) \leq L_1 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x,y)^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

Moreover

$$d(\xi_n, \hat{\zeta}_n^n) \leq C_2 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} d(x,y)^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

Hence,

$$d(\zeta_n, \hat{\zeta}_n^n) \leq (C_2 + L_1) e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}}.$$

Let n_0 be such that $(C_2 + L_1)e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n_0)}} \leq e^{\theta\kappa_0^{(n_0)}}\delta^{\overline{\theta}}$ so that for $n \geq n_0$ we have

$$d(\zeta_n, \hat{\zeta}_n^n) \leq e^{\theta\kappa_0^{(n)}}\delta^{\overline{\theta}}. \tag{9}$$

Given $\xi = (x, v) \in T\mathbb{R}^k$ define $\|\xi\| = \|v\|$. For each i, the map $S\mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $\zeta \to \log \|Df_i(\zeta)\|$ is β-Hölder on $S\mathbb{R}^k$ with uniform constant C_3. Recall our $\hat{\theta} < \theta$ and ω with $\hat{\omega} = \sup \kappa_n \hat{\theta} + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n) < 0$. Let

$$K_1 := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_3 \left(\delta^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\hat{\omega}k}\right)^{\beta}.$$

Lemma 3.4. *For all $n \geq n_0$*

$$\exp(-K_1 e^{\beta(\theta-\hat{\theta})\kappa_0^{(n)}}) \leq \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \hat{\zeta}_i^n\|}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \zeta_i\|} \leq \exp(K_1 e^{\beta(\theta-\hat{\theta})\kappa_0^{(n)}}).$$

(Note in particular that the middle ratio goes to 1 as $n \to \infty$.)

Proof. Recalling Lemma 3.1 (with $r = \delta$ and estimates (8) and (9)), for $n \geq n_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\log \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \hat{\zeta}_i^n\|}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \zeta_i\|}\right| &= \left|\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df_i \hat{\zeta}_i^n\| - \log \|Df_i \zeta_i\|\right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_3 d(\hat{\zeta}_i^n, \zeta_i)^{\beta} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_3 \left(\delta^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_i^{(n-i)} - \gamma_i^{(n-i)})}\right)^{\beta} \\
&\leq e^{\beta\kappa_0^{(n)}(\theta-\hat{\theta})} K_1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly, letting

$$K_2 = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} C_3 L_1^{\beta} e^{\overline{\kappa}\overline{\theta}\beta i}\right)$$

we have

Lemma 3.5. *For all $n > 0$*

$$K_2^{-1} \leq \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \xi_i\|}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df_i \zeta_i\|} \leq K_2$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\log\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\|Df_i\xi_i\|}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\|Df_i\zeta_i\|}\right| &= \left|\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\log\|Df_i\xi_i\| - \log\|Df_i\zeta_i\|\|\right| \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_3 d(\xi_i,\zeta_i)^\beta \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_3\left[L_1 d(x_i,y_i)^{\overline{\theta}}\right]^\beta \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} C_3 L_1^\beta\left(e^{\kappa_0^{(i)}\overline{\theta}}\right)^\beta d(x,y)^\beta \\ &\le \log(K_2).\end{aligned}$$

□

Approximate the derivatives $Dh\colon TW_0^c(p)\to TW_0^c(q)$ by the bundle maps

$$\Delta_n\colon TW_0^c(p,1)\to TW_0^c(q)$$

defined as follows: given $n\ge 0$ and $(x,v)\in TW_0^c(p)$ let

$$\Delta_n\colon (x,v)\mapsto Df_n^{(-n)}\left(\left(\|Df_0^{(n)}(v)\|(h^s_{p_n,q_n,n})_*((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,\tfrac{v}{\|v\|}))\right)\right).$$

Note that $(\Delta_n)_*=h_*$. From Lemma 3.5, with $h_*(x,v)=(y,w)$ we have

$$\|\Delta_n(x,v)\| = \frac{\|D_x f_0^{(n)}(v)\|}{\|D_y f_0^{(n)}(w)\|}\le K_2.$$

In particular, $\|\Delta_n\|$ is uniformly bounded.

Also, given $\xi=(x,v)\in SW_0^c(p)$ we have

$$\|Dh_n(\xi)\| = \|\Delta_n(\xi)\|\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\|Df_i\zeta_i^n\|}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\|Df_i\hat{\zeta}_i\|}\cdot\|D\pi_{p_n,q_n,n}((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,\tfrac{v}{\|v\|}))\|.$$

It then follows from Lemma 3.4 that

$$\|Dh_n(\xi)\|-\|\Delta_n(\xi)\|\to 0$$

uniformly in $\xi\in SW_0^c(p)$. Moreover, as the the projectivization of Δ_n coincides with $(h^s_{p,q,0})_*$ we have

Claim 3.6. $\sup_{\xi\in SW_0^c(p,1)}\{\|Dh_n(\xi)-\Delta_n(\xi)\|\}\to 0$ *as* $n\to\infty$.

It follows that the sequence Dh_n converges uniformly if and only if the sequence Δ_n converges uniformly.

Lemma 3.7. *The sequence of maps* $\Delta_n\colon SW_0^c(p,1)\to TW_0^c(q)$ *is uniformly Cauchy.*

Proof. Given $\xi=(x,v)\in SW_0^c(p,1)$ with $\xi_n=(x_n,v_n)\in SD_n$, let $\zeta=(y,w)=h_*(\xi)\in SW_0^c(q)$ and $\zeta_n=(y_n,w_n)=(h^u_{p_n,q_n,n})_*(\xi_n)$. Observe that both $\Delta_n(x,v)$ and

$\Delta_{n+1}(x,v)$ have footprint y. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta_n(x,v) - \Delta_{n+1}(x,v)\| \\
&\qquad = \frac{\|D_x f_0^{(n)}(v)\|}{\|D_y f_0^{(n)}(w)\|}\|D_{y_n} f_n(w_n)\|^{-1} \qquad (10)\\
&\qquad\quad \cdot (\|D_{y_n}(f_n)(w_n)\| - \|D_{x_n}(f_n)(v_n)\|) \\
&\qquad \le K_2 C_1 \left(C_1 L_1 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} + C_1 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\beta}\right) \\
&\qquad \le K_2 C_1 2 C_1 L_1 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} \qquad (11)\\
&\qquad \le K_2 C_1 2 C_1 L_1 e^{\overline{\theta}\overline{\kappa} n}. \qquad \square
\end{aligned}$$

From Claim 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 it follows that the sequence of maps Dh_n converges uniformly. As h_n converges to h we necessarily have that $h = h^s_{p,q,n}$ is differentiable and that Dh_n converges to Dh. Furthermore, $\|Dh^s_{p,q,n}\| \le K_2$. This completes the proof of C^1 properties in Theorem 2.4.

3.6. **Step 4: Hölder continuity of Dh.** We have the following claim.

Claim 3.8. *There is a $c_0 > 0$ so that if $d(x_k, y_k) \le 1$ for all $0 \le k \le n-1$ and $d((x,v),(y,w)) \le 1$ then*

$$d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,v),(f_0^{(n)})_*(y,w)) \le e^{c_0 n} d((x,v),(y,w))^\beta$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,v),(f_0^{(n)})_*(y,w)) &\le d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,v),(f_0^{(n)})_*(x,w)) + d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,w),(f_0^{(n)})_*(y,w)) \\
&\le (C_1)^{2n} d(v,w) + d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,w),(f_0^{(n)})_*(y,w))
\end{aligned}$$

Also proceeding inductively we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d((f_0^{(n)})_*(x,w),(f_0^{(n)})_*(y,w)) &= d((D_{x_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_x f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w),(D_{y_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_y f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w)) \\
&\le d((D_{x_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_x f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w),(D_{y_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_x f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w)) \\
&\quad + d((D_{y_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_x f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w),(D_{y_{n-1}} f_{n-1})_*(D_y f_0^{(n-1)})_*(w)) \\
&\le C_1 d(x_{n-1},y_{n-1})^\beta + C_1(n-1)C_1^{(1+\beta)(n-1)} d(x,y)^\beta \\
&\le C_1 (C_1)^{n\beta} d(x,y)^\beta + C_1(n-1)C_1^{(1+\beta)(n-1)} d(x,y)^\beta \\
&\le n C_1^{(1+\beta)n} d(x,y)^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Take $c_0 = (\log C_1)(1+\beta) + 1$. $\square$

We now show that the maps $h_*\colon SW_0^c(p,1) \to SW_0^c(q)$ and $Dh\colon SW_0^c(p,1) \to TW_0^c(q)$ are Hölder continuous.

Given $\epsilon > 0$ take

- $a_0 = \max\left\{\sup\{\frac{\kappa_n - \hat{\gamma}_n}{\kappa_n}\}, \sup\{\frac{\overline{\theta}\kappa_n - \beta\hat{\gamma}_n - \epsilon}{\beta\kappa_n}\}, \sup\{\frac{\kappa_n\overline{\theta} - c_0 - \epsilon}{\overline{\theta}\kappa_n\beta}\}\right\} > 1$;
- Set $\overline{\alpha} = \min\left\{\inf\{\frac{\kappa_n - \gamma_n}{a_0\kappa_n}\}, \inf\{\frac{\theta\kappa_n + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n)}{\kappa_n a_0}\}, \frac{\overline{\theta}}{a_0}\right\}$. Note $0 < \overline{\alpha} < 1$.
- Recall our fixed ρ_0 with $\rho(p,q,0) \le \rho_0 < \delta$ satisfying (6) and let $\rho = \rho_0/(1 + 2C_2)^{\theta^{-1}}$.

Let $q \in W_0^s(p)$ and as before let $h = h^s_{p,q,0}$. Assume now that $d(p,q) \le \rho$.

Claim 3.9. *The function h_* is $\overline{\alpha}$-Hölder with constant uniform in all parameters.*

Proof. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$r_n := \rho e^{\kappa_0^{(n)} a_0}.$$

Consider any pair $\xi := (x, v)$ and $\xi' := (x', v')$ in $SW_0^c(p, 1)$. It is enough to consider pairs that are sufficiently close so that for some $1 \leq n$:

$$d(x, x') \leq r_n, d(v, v') \leq (r_n)^{\overline{\theta}}, \text{ and either } d(x, x') \geq r_{n+1} \text{ or } d(v, v') \geq r_{n+1}^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

Let $\zeta = (y, w) = h_*(\xi)$ and $\zeta^n = (y^n, w^n) = (h_n)_*(\xi)$. Similarly define ζ' and ζ'^n. From (7) we have

$$d(\zeta, \zeta^n) \leq e^{(\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})} L_1 \leq L_1 \rho^{-\overline{\alpha}} e^{\mu\overline{\alpha}a_0} r_{n+1}^{\overline{\alpha}}$$

and

$$d(\zeta', \zeta'^n) \leq e^{(\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})} L_1 \leq L_1 \rho^{-\overline{\alpha}} e^{\mu\overline{\alpha}a_0} r_{n+1}^{\overline{\alpha}}.$$

Note that for all $0 \leq k \leq n$ we have

$$d(x_k, x_k') \leq \rho e^{a_0 \kappa_0^{(n)} + \hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} \leq \rho e^{\kappa_0^{(k)}} \leq \delta.$$

Also note that, as $\beta\kappa_n < \kappa_n\theta + \beta\hat{\gamma}_n$ for all n, we have $a_0 \geq \frac{\theta}{\beta} \geq \frac{\theta}{\beta\overline{\theta}}$. From Claim 3.8, for all $0 \leq k \leq n$ we have

$$(\xi_k, \zeta_k) \leq e^{c_0 k} (r_n)^{\overline{\theta}\beta} = e^{c_0 k} \rho^{\overline{\theta}\beta} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)} a_0 \overline{\theta}\beta} \leq \rho^{\overline{\theta}\beta} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta}.$$

From the properties of the maps π_n we have $d(x_n, y_n^n) \leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho$, $d(x_n', y_n'^n) \leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho$, $d(v_n, w_n^n) \leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\overline{\theta}} \rho^{\overline{\theta}}$, and $d(v_n', w_n'^n) \leq C_2 e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\overline{\theta}} \rho^{\overline{\theta}}$. Thus

$$d(y_n^n, y_n'^n) \leq (1 + 2C_2) e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho \leq (1 + 2C_2)^{\overline{\theta}^{-1}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}} \rho$$

and

$$d(w_n^n, w_n'^n) \leq (1 + 2C_2) e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta} \rho^{\overline{\theta}\beta}.$$

From Lemma 3.1 we have

$$d(y^n, y'^n) \leq (1 + 2C_2) e^{\kappa_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)}} \rho \leq (1 + 2C_2) e^{\mu\overline{\alpha}a_0} \rho^{1-\overline{\alpha}} (r_{n+1})^{\overline{\alpha}}$$

and (from Lemma 3.1 with $r = (1 + 2C_2)^{\overline{\theta}^{-1}} \rho < \delta$)

$$d(w^n, w'^n) \leq (1 + 2C_2) \rho^{\overline{\theta}} e^{\kappa_0^{(n)}\theta + (1+\alpha)(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)} - \gamma_0^{(n)})} \leq (1 + 2C_2) e^{\mu\theta a_0 \overline{\alpha}} (r_{n+1})^{\overline{\alpha}}.$$

It follows that there is some uniform $K_3 > 0$ so that

$$d(\zeta, \zeta') \leq K_3 r_{n+1}^{\overline{\alpha}} \leq K_3 (r_{n+1}^{\overline{\theta}})^{\overline{\alpha}}$$

whence $d(\zeta, \zeta') \leq K_3 d(\xi, \xi')^{\overline{\alpha}}$. □

Claim 3.10. *The function $(x, v) \mapsto \log \|D_x h(v)\|$ is $(\overline{\theta}\overline{\alpha})$-Hölder on $SW_0^c(p, 1)$.*

Proof. We retain all notation from the previous proof. In particular, $d(x, x') \leq r_n$; $d(v, v') \leq (r_n)^{\overline{\theta}}$; and either $d(x, x') \geq r_{n+1}$ or $d(v, v') \geq r_{n+1}^{\overline{\theta}}$.

Recall that for all $(x, v) \in SW_0^c(p)$ we have $\|\Delta_n(x, v)\| - \|D_x h(v)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, from (11) we have that for some uniform K_4 that

$$|\|\Delta_n(x, v)\| - \|D_x h(v)\|| \leq K_4 e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} \leq K_5 (r_{n+1})^{\overline{\alpha}} \tag{12}$$

We have that

$$\log(\|\Delta_n(x,v)\|) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log\|D_{x_j} f_j v_j\| - \log\|D_{y_j} f_j w_j\|.$$

Let $L_2 \geq \|Dh\|$. Then for all $0 \leq j \leq n$ we have

- $d(x_j, x_j') \leq e^{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} d(x,x')$ whence $d(y_j, y_j') \leq L_2 e^{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} d(x,x')$
- $d(v_j, v_j') \leq e^{c_0 j} d((x,v),(x',v'))^\beta$
- $d(w_j, w_j') \leq K_3 d(v_j, v_j')^{\overline{\alpha}} \leq K_3 e^{\overline{\alpha} c_0 j} d((x,v),(x',v'))^{\overline{\alpha}\beta}$.

Then for some uniform choice of K_6, K_7 and K_8 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\log\|\Delta_n(x,v)\| - \log\|\Delta_n(x',v')\||\\
&\quad\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left|\log\|D_{x_j} f_j v_j\| - \log\|D_{y_j} f_j w_j\| - \log\|D_{x_j'} f_j v_j'\| + \log\|D_{y_j'} f_j w_j'\|\right|\\
&\quad\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left|\log\|D_{x_j} f_j v_j\| - \log\|D_{x_j'} f_j v_j'\|\right|\\
&\qquad + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left|\log\|D_{y_j} f_j w_j\| - \log\|D_{y_j'} f_j w_j'\|\right|\\
&\quad\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} C_1^2 d(v_j, v_j') + C_3 d(x_j, x_j')^\beta + C_1^2 d(w_j, w_j') + C_3 d(y_j, y_j')^\beta\\
&\quad\leq K_6 n \left(e^{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)}\beta} d(x,x')^\beta + e^{c_0 n} d(\xi,\xi')^\beta + e^{\overline{\alpha} c_0 n} d(\xi,\xi')^{\overline{\alpha}\beta}\right)\\
&\quad\leq K_7 \left(e^{\epsilon n + \hat{\gamma}_0^{(n)}\beta} d(x,x')^\beta + e^{(c_0+\epsilon)n} d(\xi,\xi')^\beta + e^{\overline{\alpha}(c_0+\epsilon)n} d(\xi,\xi')^{\overline{\alpha}\beta}\right)\\
&\quad\leq K_7 (e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} + e^{\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}} + e^{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\theta}\kappa_0^{(n)}})\\
&\quad\leq K_8 (r_{n+1})^{\overline{\theta}\overline{\alpha}} \leq K_8 (r_{n+1}^{\overline{\theta}})^{\overline{\theta}\overline{\alpha}}
\end{aligned}$$

Combined with (12), it follows that $(x,v) \mapsto \|D_x h(v)\|$ is $(\overline{\theta}\overline{\alpha})$-Hölder on $SW^c(p,1)$. □

4. Ergodicity of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms

We refer the reader to [BW1] for definitions and complete arguements. Let M be a compact manifold and for $\beta > 0$ let $f\colon M \to M$ be a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism. We assume f admits a partially hyperbolic splitting $E^s(x) \oplus E^c(x) \oplus E^u(x)$; that is there are functions

$$\mu(x) < \nu(x) < \gamma(x) < \hat{\gamma}(x)^{-1} < \hat{\nu}(x)^{-1} < \hat{\mu}(x)^{-1}$$

with $\hat{\nu}(x), \nu(x) < 1$, and $\hat{\gamma}(x) \leq \gamma(x)$ such that

- $\mu(x)\|v\| \leq \|D_x f v\| \leq \nu(x)$ for all $v \in E^s(x)$
- $\gamma(x)\|v\| \leq \|D_x f v\| \leq \hat{\gamma}(x)^{-1}$ for all $v \in E^c(x)$
- $\hat{\nu}(x)^{-1}\|v\| \leq \|D_x f v\| \leq \hat{\mu}(x)^{-1}$ for all $v \in E^u(x)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f\colon M \to M$ be a volume preserving, essentially accessible, partially hyperbolic $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism. Let $\overline{\theta} < \beta$ be such that*

$$\nu(x)\gamma^{-1}(x) < \mu(x)^{\overline{\theta}}, \quad \hat{\nu}(x)\hat{\gamma}^{-1}(x) < \hat{\mu}(x)^{\overline{\theta}}.$$

Assume f satisfies the strong center bunching hypothesis: for some $0 < \theta < \overline{\theta}$ with

$$\nu(x)^\theta \geq \nu(x)^\beta \gamma(x)^{-\beta}, \quad \hat{\nu}(x)^\theta \geq \hat{\nu}(x)^\beta \hat{\gamma}(x)^{-\beta} \tag{13}$$

we have

$$\max\{\nu(x), \hat{\nu}(x)\}^\theta \leq \gamma\hat{\gamma}^{-1}.$$

Then f is ergodic and has the K-property.

Noting that $\theta = \overline{\theta}\beta$ satisfies (13), we have as the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *If in Theorem 4.1 we have*

$$\max\{\nu(x), \hat{\nu}(x)\}^{\overline{\theta}\beta} \leq \gamma\hat{\gamma}^{-1}$$

then f is ergodic and has the K-property.

Remark 4.3. Theorem 2.4 establishes that the smoothness of unstable holonomies inside center-unstable manifolds for a choice of the globalized dynamics. In the language of [BW1], this establishes the smoothness of holonomy maps by *fake stable manifolds* inside of *fake center-stable manifolds*.

In the case that the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism $f\colon M \to M$ is dynamically coherent, one could adapt the proof of Theorem 2.4 to show the that the holonomy maps by true stable manifolds inside true center-stable manifolds is $C^{1+\text{Hölder}}$.

5. Ledrappier–Young entropy formula

For $\beta > 0$, let $f\colon M \to M$ be a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism of a compact k-dimensional manifold M. Let μ be an ergodic, f-invariant Borel probability measure. We have the following generalizations of the main results of [LY1, LY2].

Theorem 5.1 ([LY2, Theorem A])**.** *$h_\mu(f)$ satisfies the Pesin entropy formula if and only if μ has the SRB property.*

Theorem 5.2 ([LY2, Theorem C'])**.** *For any measure μ, the entropy formula of* [LY2, Theorem C'] *remains valid for $h_\mu(f)$.*

5.1. **Lyapunov charts.** Given M, $f\colon M \to M$ and μ as above, let Λ denote the set of *regular points*, $T_xM = \oplus E^i(x)$ the Oseledec's splitting, and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \cdots > \lambda_p$ denote the Lyapunov exponents. Fix a decomposition $\mathbb{R}^k = \oplus \mathbb{R}^i$ where $\dim \mathbb{R}^i = m_i$ is the dimension of $E_i(x)$ for $x \in \Lambda$. Define the norm $\|\cdot\|'$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ as follows: writing $v = \sum v_i$, set $\|v\|' = \max\{\|v_i\|\}$ where $\|v_i\|$ restricts to the standard norm on each $\mathbb{R}^i$. Let $\lambda_0 = \max\{|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_p|\}$.

Fix a background Riemannian metric and induced distance on M. We have the following standard construction. (See for example [LY1, Appendix], [FHY, §2].)

Proposition 5.3. *For every sufficiently small $0 < \hat{\epsilon} < 1$ there is a measurable function $\hat{\ell}\colon \Lambda \to [1, \infty)$ and a measurable family of C^∞ embeddings $\{\hat{\Phi}_x, x \in \Lambda\}$ with the following properties:*

(i) *$\hat{\Phi}_x\colon B(0, \hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}) \to M$ is a C^∞ diffeomorphism with $\hat{\Phi}_x(0) = x$;*
(ii) *$D_0\hat{\Phi}_x\mathbb{R}^i = E^i(x)$;*
(iii) *the map $\hat{f}_x\colon B(0, e^{-\lambda_0 - 3\hat{\epsilon}}\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}) \to B(0, \hat{\ell}(f(x))^{-1})$ given by*

$$\hat{f}_x(v) = \hat{\Phi}^{-1}_{f(x)} \circ f \circ \hat{\Phi}_x(v)$$

is well-defined;

(iv) $D_0\hat{f}_x\mathbb{R}^i = \mathbb{R}^i$, *and for* $v \in \mathbb{R}^i$,
$$e^{\lambda_i - \hat{\epsilon}}\|v\|' \leq \|D_0\hat{f}_x v\|' \leq e^{\lambda_i + \hat{\epsilon}}\|v\|';$$
(v) $\text{Höl}^\beta(D\hat{f}_x) \leq \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\ell}(x))^\beta$ *whence* $\text{Lip}\left(\hat{f}_x - D_0\hat{f}_x\right) \leq \hat{\epsilon}$*;*
(vi) *similar statements to* (iii),(iv) *and* (v) *hold for* f^{-1}*;*
(vii) *there is a uniform* k_0 *so that* $\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1} \leq \text{Lip}(\hat{\Phi}_x) \leq k_0$*;*
(viii) $e^{-\hat{\epsilon}} \leq \dfrac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)} \leq e^{\hat{\epsilon}}$.

Given $0 < \hat{\epsilon} < 1$ and corresponding function $\hat{\ell}\colon \Lambda \to [1, \infty)$ as in Proposition 5.3 define new charts $\Phi_x\colon B(0,1) \to M$ by rescaling:
$$\Phi_x(v) := \hat{\Phi}_x(\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}v).$$
We check with $\epsilon = 4\hat{\epsilon}$ and $\ell(x) = (\hat{\ell}(x))^2$ that for every $x \in \Lambda$

(a) $\Phi_x\colon B(0,1) \to M$ is a C^∞ diffeomorphism with $\Phi_x(0) = x$;
(b) $D_0\Phi_x\mathbb{R}^i = E^i(x)$;
(c) the map $\tilde{f}_x\colon B(0, e^{-\lambda_0 - 2\epsilon}) \to B(0,1)$ given by
$$\tilde{f}_x(v) := \Phi^{-1}_{f(x)} \circ f \circ \Phi_x(v) = \hat{\ell}(f(x))\left(\hat{f}_x\left(\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}v\right)\right)$$
is well-defined;
(d) $D_0\hat{f}_x\mathbb{R}^i = \mathbb{R}^i$, and for $v \in \mathbb{R}^i$,
$$e^{\lambda_i - \epsilon}\|v\|' \leq \|D_0\tilde{f}_x v\|' \leq e^{\lambda_i + \epsilon}\|v\|';$$
(e) $\text{Höl}^\beta(D\tilde{f}_x) \leq \epsilon$ whence $\text{Lip}(\tilde{f}_x - D_0\tilde{f}_x) \leq \epsilon$;
(f) similar statements to (c),(d) and (e) hold for f^{-1};
(g) there is a uniform k_0 so that $\ell(x)^{-1} \leq \text{Lip}(\tilde{\Phi}_x) \leq k_0$;
(h) $e^{-\epsilon} \leq \dfrac{\ell(f(x))}{\ell(x)} \leq e^{\epsilon}$.

Indeed, (a), (b), (c), (g), and (h) follow from construction. For (d), and (e), note that for $u \in B(0,1)$, and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with $\|\xi\|' = 1$,
$$D_u\tilde{f}_x(\xi) = \hat{\ell}(f(x))D_{\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}u}\hat{f}_x(\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}\xi) = \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}D_{\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}u}\hat{f}_x(\xi)$$
hence
$$D_0\tilde{f}_x(\xi) = \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}D_0\hat{f}_x(\xi)$$
and
$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_u\tilde{f}_x(\xi) - D_v\tilde{f}_x(\xi)\|' &= \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}\|D_{\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}u}\hat{f}_x(\xi) - D_{\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}v}\hat{f}_x(\xi)\|' \\
&\leq \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}\,\text{Höl}^\beta(D\hat{f}_x)\|\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}u - \hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}v\|'^\beta \\
&\leq \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\ell}(x)^\beta\left(\hat{\ell}(x)^{-1}\right)^\beta\|u - v\|'^\beta \\
&= \frac{\hat{\ell}(f(x))}{\hat{\ell}(x)}\hat{\epsilon}\|u - v\|'^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

The family of maps $\{\Phi_x, x \in \Lambda\}$ is called a family of (ϵ, ℓ) charts. Fix a suitable bump function on $\mathbb{R}^k$ supported inside the unit ball in the $\|\cdot\|'$-norm. Then there is a constant C_1 such that for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, for any family of (ϵ, ℓ)-charts Φ_x as above, with $\tilde{f}_x$ as in (c) we may extend the maps $\tilde{f}_x$ to $F_x \colon \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ so that for every $x \in \Lambda$

(1) $F_x(u) = \tilde{f}_x(u)$ for all u with $\|u\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$;
(2) $\mathrm{Lip}_{\|\cdot\|'}(F_x - D_0\tilde{f}_x) < \epsilon$;
(3) $\mathrm{Lip}_{\|\cdot\|'}(F_x^{-1} - (D_0\tilde{f}_x)^{-1}) < \epsilon$;
(4) $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta}_{\|\cdot\|'}(DF_x) \leq C_1$;
(5) $\mathrm{Höl}^{\beta}_{\|\cdot\|'}(DF_x) \leq C_1$.

Furthermore, taking $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we can ensure all relevant estimates remain true in the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Given sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, fix a family of (ϵ, ℓ)-charts $\{\Phi_x : x \in \Lambda\}$ as above. Let $0 < \delta < 1$ be a reduction factor. For $x \in \Lambda$, let

$$S^{cu}_{\delta,x} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^k : \|\Phi^{-1}_{f^{-n}(x)} \circ f^{-n} \circ \Phi_x(y)\| < \delta \text{ for all } n \geq 0\}.$$

For $x \in \Lambda$, $\star \in \{s, u, c, su, cu\}$, and $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ let $\tilde{W}^{\star}_x(v)$ be the corresponding "fake" manifold through the point v constructed in Proposition 2.1 using the sequence of globalizations F_x along the orbit $f^j(x)$.

From the dynamics inside charts we obtain the following.

Claim 5.4. *For all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ we have $S^{cu}_{\delta,x} \subset W^{cu}_x(0)$.*

From Corollary 2.3, it follows (for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$) that the Lipschitz property of holonomies along unstable manifolds inside the center-unstable sets $S^{cu}_{\delta,x}$ derived in [LY1, (4.2)] for C^2 maps holds for $C^{1+\beta}$ maps. We similarly obtain that the holonomies along "fake" W^i manifolds is Lipschitz inside W^{i+1} manifolds. This replaces the Lipschitz estimates [LY2, Lemma 8.2.5, (8.4)]. In particular, [LY1, Proposition 5.1] and [LY2, Proposition 11.2] remain valid for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms. It follows that the results of [LY1] and [LY2] hold for $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphisms.

REFERENCES

[BPS] L. Barreira, Y. Pesin, and J. Schmeling. *Dimension and product structure of hyperbolic measures*, Ann. of Math. (2) **149**(1999), 755–783.

[BW1] K. Burns and A. Wilkinson. *On the ergodicity of partially hyperbolic systems*, Ann. of Math. (2) **171**(2010), 451–489.

[BW2] K. Burns and A. Wilkinson. *A note on stable holonomy between centers*. Preprint.

[FHY] A. Fathi, M.-R. Herman, and J.-C. Yoccoz. A proof of Pesin's stable manifold theorem. In *Geometric dynamics (Rio de Janeiro, 1981)*, volume 1007 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 177–215. Springer, Berlin, 1983.

[GPS] M. Grayson, C. Pugh, and M. Shub. *Stably ergodic diffeomorphisms*, Ann. of Math. (2) **140**(1994), 295–329.

[HPS] M. W. Hirsch, C. C. Pugh, and M. Shub. *Invariant manifolds*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 583. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.

[Jou] J.-L. Journé. *A regularity lemma for functions of several variables*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **4**(1988), 187–193.

[Led] F. Ledrappier. *Propriétés ergodiques des mesures de Sinaï*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1984), 163–188.

[LY1] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. *The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. I. Characterization of measures satisfying Pesin's entropy formula*, Ann. of Math. (2) **122**(1985), 509–539.

[LY2] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. *The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. II. Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension*, Ann. of Math. (2) **122**(1985), 540–574.

[PS1] C. Pugh and M. Shub. *Ergodic attractors*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **312**(1989), 1–54.
[PS2] C. Pugh and M. Shub. *Stable ergodicity and julienne quasi-conformality*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **2**(2000), 1–52.
[PSW] C. Pugh, M. Shub, and A. Wilkinson. *Hölder foliations*, Duke Math. J. **86**(1997), 517–546.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60637, USA
E-mail address: awb@uchicago.edu